arXiv:1409.6837v2 [hep-ph] 20 Dec 2014

$\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ in the $\mu\nu$SSM

Hai-Bin Zhang[a,b,*], Guo-Hui Luo[a,†], Tai-Fu Feng[a,b,‡],

Shu-Min Zhao[b], Tie-Jun Gao[c], Ke-Sheng Sun[a]

[a] *Department of Physics, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, 116024, China*

[b] *Department of Physics, Hebei University, Baoding, 071002, China*

[c] *Institute of theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

Abstract

The $\mu\nu$SSM, one of supersymmetric extensions beyond the Standard Model, introduces three singlet right-handed neutrino superfields to solve the μ problem and can generate three tiny Majorana neutrino masses through the seesaw mechanism. In this work, we investigate the rare decay process $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ in the $\mu\nu$SSM, under a minimal flavor violating assumption for the soft breaking terms. Constrained by the SM-like Higgs with mass around 125 GeV, the numerical results show that the new physics can fit the experimental data for $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ and further constrain the parameter space.

PACS numbers: 12.60.Jv, 13.20.He

Keywords: Supersymmetry; Rare decay

* hbzhang@mail.dlut.edu.cn

† ghuiluo@qq.com

‡ fengtf@hbu.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

The rare decay $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ is one of the most promising windows to detect the new physics (NP) beyond the Standard Model (SM), since the theoretical evaluation on the decay width of the channel is induced by loop diagrams which are sensitive to the new fields coupled to bottom quark. The current combined experimental data for the branching ratio of $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ measured by CLEO [1], BELLE [2, 3] and BABAR [4–7] give [8]

$$\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma) = (3.37 \pm 0.23) \times 10^{-4}. \tag{1}$$

Up to the next-next-to-leading order (NNLO), the theoretical prediction of $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ in the SM reads [9–14]

$$\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma) = (3.15 \pm 0.23) \times 10^{-4}, \tag{2}$$

which coincides with the experimental result very well.

As a supersymmetric extension of the SM, the μ from ν Supersymmetric Standard Model ($\mu\nu$SSM) [15–17] solves the μ problem [18] of the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) [19–21] through the lepton number breaking couplings between the right-handed neutrino superfields and the Higgses $\epsilon_{ab}\lambda_i\hat{\nu}_i^c\hat{H}_d^a\hat{H}_u^b$ in the superpotential. The μ term is generated spontaneously through right-handed neutrino superfields vacuum expectation values (VEVs), $\mu = \lambda_i \langle\tilde{\nu}_i^c\rangle$, once the electroweak symmetry is broken (EWSB). In this paper, we analyze the flavor changing neutral current (FCNC) process $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ within the framework of the $\mu\nu$SSM under a minimal flavor violating version for the soft breaking terms, constrained by the SM-like Higgs with mass around 125 GeV.

This paper has the following structure. In Section II, we present the $\mu\nu$SSM briefly, including its superpotential and the general soft SUSY-breaking terms. Section III contains the effective Lagrangian method and our notations. Then we get the Wilson coefficients of the process $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$. In Section IV, we give the numerical analysis, under some assumptions and constraints on parameter space. The conclusion is given in Section V. Some formulae are collected in Appendixes A–B.

II. THE $\mu\nu$SSM

Besides the superfields of the MSSM, the $\mu\nu$SSM introduces three exotic right-handed neutrino superfields $\hat{\nu}_i^c$, $(i = 1,\ 2,\ 3)$, which have nonzero VEVs. The corresponding superpotential of the $\mu\nu$SSM is given by [15]

$$\begin{aligned} W = \epsilon_{ab}(&Y_{u_{ij}}\hat{H}_u^b\hat{Q}_i^a\hat{u}_j^c + Y_{d_{ij}}\hat{H}_d^a\hat{Q}_i^b\hat{d}_j^c + Y_{e_{ij}}\hat{H}_d^a\hat{L}_i^b\hat{e}_j^c \\ &+Y_{\nu_{ij}}\hat{H}_u^b\hat{L}_i^a\hat{\nu}_j^c) - \epsilon_{ab}\lambda_i\hat{\nu}_i^c\hat{H}_d^a\hat{H}_u^b + \frac{1}{3}\kappa_{ijk}\hat{\nu}_i^c\hat{\nu}_j^c\hat{\nu}_k^c\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\hat{H}_d^T = \left(\hat{H}_d^0, \hat{H}_d^-\right)$, $\hat{H}_u^T = \left(\hat{H}_u^+, \hat{H}_u^0\right)$, $\hat{Q}_i^T = \left(\hat{u}_i, \hat{d}_i\right)$, $\hat{L}_i^T = \left(\hat{\nu}_i, \hat{e}_i\right)$ are $SU(2)$ doublet superfields. $\hat{d}_j^c$, $\hat{u}_j^c$ and $\hat{e}_j^c$ represent the singlet down-type quark, up-type quark and lepton superfields, respectively. Additionally, Y, λ and κ are dimensionless matrices, a vector and a totally symmetric tensor. $a, b = 1, 2$ are SU(2) indices and $i, j, k = 1,\ 2,\ 3$ are generation indices. In the Eq. (3), the first three terms are the same as those of the MSSM. Once the electroweak symmetry is broken (EWSB), the next two terms can generate the effective bilinear terms $\epsilon_{ab}\varepsilon_i\hat{H}_u^b\hat{L}_i^a$ and $\epsilon_{ab}\mu\hat{H}_d^a\hat{H}_u^b$, with $\varepsilon_i = Y_{\nu_{ij}}\left\langle\tilde{\nu}_j^c\right\rangle$ and $\mu = \lambda_i\left\langle\tilde{\nu}_i^c\right\rangle$. The last two terms explicitly violate lepton number and R-parity, and the last term can generate the effective Majorana masses for neutrinos at the electroweak scale. In this paper, the summation convention is implied on repeated indices.

In the $\mu\nu$SSM, the general soft SUSY-breaking terms are given as

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_{soft} \;=\; & m_{\tilde{Q}_{ij}}^2\tilde{Q}_i^{a*}\tilde{Q}_j^a + m_{\tilde{u}_{ij}^c}^2\tilde{u}_i^{c*}\tilde{u}_j^c + m_{\tilde{d}_{ij}^c}^2\tilde{d}_i^{c*}\tilde{d}_j^c + m_{\tilde{L}_{ij}}^2\tilde{L}_i^{a*}\tilde{L}_j^a \\ & + m_{\tilde{e}_{ij}^c}^2\tilde{e}_i^{c*}\tilde{e}_j^c + m_{H_d}^2H_d^{a*}H_d^a + m_{H_u}^2H_u^{a*}H_u^a + m_{\tilde{\nu}_{ij}^c}^2\tilde{\nu}_i^{c*}\tilde{\nu}_j^c \\ & + \epsilon_{ab}\Big[(A_uY_u)_{ij}H_u^b\tilde{Q}_i^a\tilde{u}_j^c + (A_dY_d)_{ij}H_d^a\tilde{Q}_i^b\tilde{d}_j^c + (A_eY_e)_{ij}H_d^a\tilde{L}_i^b\tilde{e}_j^c + \text{H.c.}\Big] \\ & + \left[\epsilon_{ab}(A_\nu Y_\nu)_{ij}H_u^b\tilde{L}_i^a\tilde{\nu}_j^c - \epsilon_{ab}(A_\lambda\lambda)_i\tilde{\nu}_i^cH_d^aH_u^b + \frac{1}{3}(A_\kappa\kappa)_{ijk}\tilde{\nu}_i^c\tilde{\nu}_j^c\tilde{\nu}_k^c + \text{H.c.}\right] \\ & - \frac{1}{2}\left(M_3\tilde{\lambda}_3\tilde{\lambda}_3 + M_2\tilde{\lambda}_2\tilde{\lambda}_2 + M_1\tilde{\lambda}_1\tilde{\lambda}_1 + \text{H.c.}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Here, the front two lines contain mass-squared terms of squarks, sleptons and Higgses. The next two lines include the trilinear scalar couplings. In the last line, M_3, M_2 and M_1 denote Majorana masses corresponding to gauginos $\hat{\lambda}_3$, $\hat{\lambda}_2$ and $\hat{\lambda}_1$, respectively. In addition to the terms from $\mathcal{L}_{soft}$, the tree-level scalar potential receives the usual D and F term contributions [16].

Once the electroweak symmetry is spontaneously broken, the neutral scalars develop in general the VEVs:

$$\langle H_d^0 \rangle = \upsilon_d, \qquad \langle H_u^0 \rangle = \upsilon_u, \qquad \langle \tilde{\nu}_i \rangle = \upsilon_{\nu_i}, \qquad \langle \tilde{\nu}_i^c \rangle = \upsilon_{\nu_i^c}. \tag{5}$$

One can define the neutral scalars as

$$\begin{aligned} H_d^0 &= \frac{h_d + iP_d}{\sqrt{2}} + \upsilon_d, \qquad \tilde{\nu}_i = \frac{(\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\Re} + i(\tilde{\nu}_i)^{\Im}}{\sqrt{2}} + \upsilon_{\nu_i}, \\ H_u^0 &= \frac{h_u + iP_u}{\sqrt{2}} + \upsilon_u, \qquad \tilde{\nu}_i^c = \frac{(\tilde{\nu}_i^c)^{\Re} + i(\tilde{\nu}_i^c)^{\Im}}{\sqrt{2}} + \upsilon_{\nu_i^c}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

and

$$\tan\beta = \frac{\upsilon_u}{\sqrt{\upsilon_d^2 + \upsilon_{\nu_i}\upsilon_{\nu_i}}}. \tag{7}$$

The 8×8 charged scalar mass matrix $M_{S^\pm}^2$ contains the massless unphysical Goldstone bosons $G^\pm$, which can be written as [22–25]

$$G^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\upsilon_d^2 + \upsilon_u^2 + \upsilon_{\nu_i}\upsilon_{\nu_i}}}\Big(\upsilon_d H_d^\pm - \upsilon_u H_u^\pm - \upsilon_{\nu_i}\tilde{e}_{L_i}^\pm\Big). \tag{8}$$

In the unitary gauge, the Goldstone bosons $G^\pm$ are eaten by W-boson, and disappear from the Lagrangian. Then the mass squared of W-boson is

$$m_W^2 = \frac{e^2}{2s_{_W}^2}\Big(\upsilon_u^2 + \upsilon_d^2 + \upsilon_{\nu_i}\upsilon_{\nu_i}\Big), \tag{9}$$

where e is the electromagnetic coupling constant and $s_{_W} = \sin\theta_{_W}$ with $\theta_{_W}$ is the Weinberg angle.

III. RARE DECAY $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$

The effective Hamilton for rare decay $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ at scales $\mu_b = \mathcal{O}(m_b)$ is written as [26–31]

$$H_{eff} = -\frac{4G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ts}^* V_{tb} \sum_i C_i(\mu)\mathcal{O}_i, \tag{10}$$

with G_F denoting the Fermi constant and V_{ij} denoting the quark mixing matrix elements. The Wilson coefficients $C_i(\mu)$ play the role of coupling constants at the effective operators

$\mathcal{O}_i$. The definitions of those dimension six effective operators are

$$\begin{aligned}
O_1 &= \bar{s}_i\gamma_\mu P_L c_j \bar{c}_j\gamma_\mu P_L b_i,\\
O_2 &= \bar{s}_i\gamma_\mu P_L c_i \bar{c}_j\gamma_\mu P_L b_j,\\
O_3 &= \bar{s}_i\gamma_\mu P_L b_i \sum\nolimits_q \bar{q}_j\gamma_\mu P_L q_j,\\
O_4 &= \bar{s}_i\gamma_\mu P_L b_j \sum\nolimits_q \bar{q}_j\gamma_\mu P_L q_i,\\
O_5 &= \bar{s}_i\gamma_\mu P_L b_i \sum\nolimits_q \bar{q}_j\gamma_\mu P_R q_j,\\
O_6 &= \bar{s}_i\gamma_\mu P_L b_j \sum\nolimits_q \bar{q}_j\gamma_\mu P_R q_i,
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $P_{L,R} = (1 \mp \gamma_5)/2$, $O_{1,2}$ are the current-current operators and $O_{3,\ldots,6}$ are the QCD penguin operators. In addition, $O_{7,\,8}$ and $\widetilde{O}_{7,\,8}$ are the magnetic and chromomagnetic dipole moment operators, which are defined through

$$\begin{aligned}
O_7 &= \frac{e}{16\pi^2}\bar{s}F\cdot\sigma m_b P_R b,\\
\widetilde{O}_7 &= \frac{e}{16\pi^2}\bar{s}F\cdot\sigma m_b P_L b,\\
O_8 &= \frac{g_s}{16\pi^2}\bar{s}G\cdot\sigma m_b P_R b,\\
\widetilde{O}_8 &= \frac{g_s}{16\pi^2}\bar{s}G\cdot\sigma m_b P_L b,
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $F_{\mu\nu}$ and $G_{\mu\nu} = G^a_{\mu\nu}T^a$ are the electromagnetic and strong field strength tensors, $T^a(a = 1,\ldots,8)$ are $\mathrm{SU(3)_c}$ generators, and g_s represents the strong coupling respectively.

Compared with the SM, the Feynman diagrams contributing to the process $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ from exotic fields in the $\mu\nu$SSM are drawn in Fig. 1, where S^-_α $(\alpha = 2,\ldots,8)$ denote charged scalars, U^+_I $(I = 1,\ldots,6)$ denote up-type squarks, u_i $(i = 1,2,3)$ denote three generation of up-type quarks and χ_β $(\beta = 1,\ldots,5)$ denote charged fermions.

We could write the Wilson coefficients of the process $b \to s\gamma$ from the Feynman diagrams in Fig. 1 at the electroweak scale μ_{EW} as follow:

$$C^{NP}_7(\mu_{EW}) = C^{NP}_{7\gamma}(\mu_{EW}) + \widetilde{C}^{NP}_{7\gamma}(\mu_{EW}), \tag{13}$$

where the new physics contributions read

$$\widetilde{C}^{NP}_{7\gamma}(\mu_{EW}) = \widetilde{C}^{NP}_{7\gamma a}(\mu_{EW}) + \widetilde{C}^{NP}_{7\gamma b}(\mu_{EW}) + \widetilde{C}^{NP}_{7\gamma c}(\mu_{EW}) + \widetilde{C}^{NP}_{7\gamma d}(\mu_{EW}), \tag{14}$$



FIG. 1: The Feynman diagrams contributing to $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ from exotic fields in the $\mu\nu$SSM, compared with the SM.

$$\widetilde{C}_{7\gamma a}^{NP}(\mu_{EW}) = \sum_{u_i,S_\alpha^-} \frac{s_W^2}{2e^2V_{ts}^*V_{tb}}\Big\{\frac{1}{2}C_R^{S_\alpha^-\bar{s}u_i}C_R^{S_\alpha^-\bar{b}u_i*}\Big[-I_3(x_{u_i},x_{S_\alpha^-})+I_4(x_{u_i},x_{S_\alpha^-})\Big] + \frac{m_{u_i}}{m_b}C_L^{S_\alpha^-\bar{s}u_i}C_R^{S_\alpha^-\bar{b}u_i*}\Big[-I_1(x_{u_i},x_{S_\alpha^-})+I_3(x_{u_i},x_{S_\alpha^-})\Big]\Big\}, \tag{15}$$

$$\widetilde{C}_{7\gamma b}^{NP}(\mu_{EW}) = \sum_{u_i,S_\alpha^-} \frac{s_W^2}{3e^2V_{ts}^*V_{tb}}\Big\{\frac{1}{2}C_R^{S_\alpha^-\bar{s}u_i}C_R^{S_\alpha^-\bar{b}u_i*}\Big[-I_1(x_{u_i},x_{S_\alpha^-})+2I_3(x_{u_i},x_{S_\alpha^-}) -I_4(x_{u_i},x_{S_\alpha^-})\Big] + \frac{m_{u_i}}{m_b}C_L^{S_\alpha^-\bar{s}u_i}C_R^{S_\alpha^-\bar{b}u_i*}\Big[I_1(x_{u_i},x_{S_\alpha^-})-I_2(x_{u_i},x_{S_\alpha^-}) -I_3(x_{u_i},x_{S_\alpha^-})\Big]\Big\}, \tag{16}$$

$$\widetilde{C}_{7\gamma c}^{NP}(\mu_{EW}) = \sum_{\chi_\beta,U_I^+} \frac{s_W^2}{3e^2V_{ts}^*V_{tb}}\Big\{\frac{1}{2}C_R^{U_I^+\bar{s}\chi_\beta}C_R^{U_I^+\bar{b}\chi_\beta*}\Big[I_3(x_{\chi_\beta},x_{U_I^+})-I_4(x_{\chi_\beta},x_{U_I^+})\Big] + \frac{m_{\chi_\beta}}{m_b}C_L^{U_I^+\bar{s}\chi_\beta}C_R^{U_I^+\bar{b}\chi_\beta*}\Big[I_1(x_{\chi_\beta},x_{U_I^+})-I_3(x_{\chi_\beta},x_{U_I^+})\Big]\Big\}, \tag{17}$$

$$\widetilde{C}_{7\gamma d}^{NP}(\mu_{EW}) = \sum_{\chi_\beta,U_I^+} \frac{s_W^2}{2e^2V_{ts}^*V_{tb}}\Big\{\frac{1}{2}C_R^{U_I^+\bar{s}\chi_\beta}C_R^{U_I^+\bar{b}\chi_\beta*}\Big[-I_1(x_{\chi_\beta},x_{U_I^+})+2I_3(x_{\chi_\beta},x_{U_I^+}) -I_4(x_{\chi_\beta},x_{U_I^+})\Big] + \frac{m_{\chi_\beta}}{m_b}C_L^{U_I^+\bar{s}\chi_\beta}C_R^{U_I^+\bar{b}\chi_\beta*}\Big[I_1(x_{\chi_\beta},x_{U_I^+})-I_2(x_{\chi_\beta},x_{U_I^+}) -I_3(x_{\chi_\beta},x_{U_I^+})\Big]\Big\}, \tag{18}$$

$$C_{7\gamma}^{NP}(\mu_{EW}) = \widetilde{C}_{7\gamma}^{NP}(\mu_{EW})\Big|_{L\leftrightarrow R}. \tag{19}$$

Here the concrete expressions for coupling coefficients $C_{L,R}$ and form factors I_i $(i = 1, \ldots, 4)$ can be found in Appendixes A–B. Additionally, $x = m^2/m_W^2$, where m is the mass for the corresponding particle and m_W is the mass for the W-boson.

The Feynman diagrams of the process $b \to sg$ from exotic fields in the $\mu\nu$SSM compared with the SM are shown in Fig. 1(b) and Fig. 1(c). Similarly, the Wilson coefficients of the process $b \to sg$ at electroweak scale are

$$C_8^{NP}(\mu_{EW}) = C_{8g}^{NP}(\mu_{EW}) + \widetilde{C}_{8g}^{NP}(\mu_{EW}), \tag{20}$$

$$\widetilde{C}_{8g}^{NP}(\mu_{EW}) = \left[\widetilde{C}_{7\gamma b}^{NP}(\mu_{EW}) + \widetilde{C}_{7\gamma c}^{NP}(\mu_{EW})\right]/Q_u, \tag{21}$$

$$C_{8g}^{NP}(\mu_{EW}) = \widetilde{C}_{8g}^{NP}(\mu_{EW})\Big|_{L\leftrightarrow R}, \tag{22}$$

where $Q_u = 2/3$.

In the $\mu\nu$SSM, the expression for the branching ratio of $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ is given as follow

$$\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma) = R\Big(|C_{7\gamma}(\mu_b)|^2 + N(E_\gamma)\Big)\,, \tag{23}$$

where the overall factor $R = 2.47 \times 10^{-3}$, and the nonperturbative contribution $N(E_\gamma) = (3.6 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$ [30]. $C_{7\gamma}(\mu_b)$ is defined by

$$C_{7\gamma}(\mu_b) = C_{7\gamma}^{SM}(\mu_b) + C_7^{NP}(\mu_b). \tag{24}$$

where we choose the hadron scale $\mu_b = 2.5$ GeV and use the SM contribution at NNLO level $C_{7\gamma}^{SM}(\mu_b) = -0.3523$ [30–33]. The Wilson coefficients for new physics at the bottom quark scale can be written as [34, 35]

$$C_7^{NP}(\mu_b) \approx 0.5696 C_7^{NP}(\mu_{EW}) + 0.1107 C_8^{NP}(\mu_{EW}). \tag{25}$$

IV. NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

There are many free parameters in the SUSY extensions of the SM. In order to obtain a more transparent numerical results, we adopt the minimal flavor violating (MFV) assumption for some parameters in the $\mu\nu$SSM, which assumes

$$\lambda_i = \lambda, \qquad \kappa_{ijk} = \kappa\delta_{ij}\delta_{jk}, \quad (A_\kappa\kappa)_{ijk} = A_\kappa\kappa\delta_{ij}\delta_{jk},$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(A_\lambda\lambda)_i = A_\lambda\lambda, \quad Y_{\nu_{ij}} = Y_{\nu_i}\delta_{ij}, \qquad Y_{e_{ij}} = Y_{e_i}\delta_{ij},\\
&\upsilon_{\nu_i^c} = \upsilon_{\nu^c}, \quad (A_\nu Y_\nu)_{ij} = a_{\nu_i}\delta_{ij}, \quad (A_e Y_e)_{ij} = A_e Y_{e_i}\delta_{ij},\\
&m^2_{\tilde{L}_{ij}} = m^2_{\tilde{L}}\delta_{ij}, \quad m^2_{\tilde{\nu}^c_{ij}} = m^2_{\tilde{\nu}^c_i}\delta_{ij}, \quad m^2_{\tilde{e}^c_{ij}} = m^2_{\tilde{e}^c}\delta_{ij},\\
&m^2_{\tilde{Q}_{ij}} = m^2_{\tilde{Q}_i}\delta_{ij}, \quad m^2_{\tilde{u}^c_{ij}} = m^2_{\tilde{u}^c_i}\delta_{ij}, \quad m^2_{\tilde{d}^c_{ij}} = m^2_{\tilde{d}^c_i}\delta_{ij},
\end{aligned} \tag{26}
$$

and one can assume

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(A_u Y_u)_{ij} = A_{u_i} Y_{u_{ij}}, \quad Y_{u_{ij}} = Y_{u_i} V^u_{L_{ij}},\\
&(A_d Y_d)_{ij} = A_{d_i} Y_{d_{ij}}, \quad Y_{d_{ij}} = Y_{d_i} V^d_{L_{ij}},
\end{aligned} \tag{27}
$$

where $V = V^u_L V^{d\dagger}_L$ denotes the CKM matrix [36]. Restrained by the quark and lepton masses, we could have

$$
Y_{u_i} \simeq \frac{m_{u_i}}{\upsilon_u}, \qquad Y_{d_i} \simeq \frac{m_{d_i}}{\upsilon_d}, \qquad Y_{e_i} = \frac{m_{l_i}}{\upsilon_d}, \tag{28}
$$

where m_{u_i}, m_{d_i} and m_{l_i} are the up-quark, down-quark and charged lepton masses, respectively, and we choose the values from Ref. [36].

At the EW scale, the soft masses $m^2_{\tilde{H}_d}$, $m^2_{\tilde{H}_u}$ and $m^2_{\tilde{\nu}^c_i}$ can be derived from the minimization conditions of the tree-level neutral scalar potential, which are given in Refs. [16, 22]. Ignoring the terms of the second order in Y_ν and assuming $(\upsilon^2_{\nu_i} + \upsilon^2_d - \upsilon^2_u) \approx (\upsilon^2_d - \upsilon^2_u)$, one can solve the minimization conditions of the tree-level neutral scalar potential with respect to υ_{ν_i} $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ as [37]

$$
\upsilon_{\nu_i} = \frac{\lambda\upsilon_d(\upsilon^2_u + \upsilon^2_{\nu^c}) - \kappa\upsilon_u\upsilon^2_{\nu^c}}{m^2_{\tilde{L}} + \frac{G^2}{4}(\upsilon^2_d - \upsilon^2_u)} Y_{\nu_i} - \frac{\upsilon_u\upsilon_{\nu^c}}{m^2_{\tilde{L}} + \frac{G^2}{4}(\upsilon^2_d - \upsilon^2_u)} a_{\nu_i}, \tag{29}
$$

where $G^2 = g^2_1 + g^2_2$ and $g_1 c_W = g_2 s_W = e$.

In the $\mu\nu$SSM, the sneutrino sector may appear the tachyons. The masses squared of the tachyons are negative. So, we need analyse the masses of the sneutrinos. The masses of left-handed sneutrinos are basically determined by $m_{\tilde{L}}$, and the three right-handed sneutrinos are essentially degenerated. The CP-even and CP-odd right-handed sneutrino masses squared can be approximately written as [25]

$$
m^2_{S_{5+i}} \approx (A_\kappa + 4\kappa\upsilon_{\nu^c})\kappa\upsilon_{\nu^c} + A_\lambda\lambda\upsilon_d\upsilon_u/\upsilon_{\nu^c} - 2\lambda^2(\upsilon^2_d + \upsilon^2_u), \tag{30}
$$

$$
m^2_{P_{5+i}} \approx -3A_\kappa\kappa\upsilon_{\nu^c} + (A_\lambda/\upsilon_{\nu^c} + 4\kappa)\lambda\upsilon_d\upsilon_u - 2\lambda^2(\upsilon^2_d + \upsilon^2_u). \tag{31}
$$

Here, the main contribution for the mass squared is the first term as κ is large, in the limit of $\upsilon_{\nu^c} \gg \upsilon_{u,d}$. Therefore, we could use the approximate relation

$$-4\kappa\upsilon_{\nu^c} \lesssim A_\kappa \lesssim 0, \tag{32}$$

to avoid the tachyons.

Before calculation, the constraints on the parameters of the $\mu\nu$SSM from neutrino experiments should be considered at first. Three flavor neutrinos $\nu_{e,\mu,\tau}$ could mix into three massive neutrinos $\nu_{1,2,3}$ during their flight, and the mixings are described by the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata unitary matrix U_{PMNS} [38, 39]. The experimental observations of the parameters in U_{PMNS} for the normal mass hierarchy show that [40]

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sin^2\theta_{12} = 0.302^{+0.013}_{-0.012}, \qquad \Delta m^2_{21} = 7.50^{+0.18}_{-0.19}\times 10^{-5}\mathrm{eV}^2,\\
&\sin^2\theta_{23} = 0.413^{+0.037}_{-0.025}, \qquad \Delta m^2_{31} = 2.473^{+0.070}_{-0.067}\times 10^{-3}\mathrm{eV}^2,\\
&\sin^2\theta_{13} = 0.0227^{+0.0023}_{-0.0024}.
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

In the $\mu\nu$SSM, the three neutrino masses are obtained through a TeV scale seesaw mechanism [15, 37, 41–45]. Assumed that the charged lepton mass matrix in the flavor basis is in the diagonal form, we parameterize the unitary matrix which diagonalizes the effective light neutrino mass matrix m_{eff} (see Ref. [22]) as [46, 47]

$$\begin{aligned}
U_\nu = &\begin{pmatrix}
c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta}\\
-s_{12}c_{23}-c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{12}c_{23}-s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & s_{23}c_{13}\\
s_{12}s_{23}-c_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & -c_{12}s_{23}-s_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{23}c_{13}
\end{pmatrix}\\
&\times diag(1, e^{i\frac{\alpha_{21}}{2}}, e^{i\frac{\alpha_{31}}{2}})\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where $c_{ij} = \cos\theta_{ij}$, $s_{ij} = \sin\theta_{ij}$. In our calculation, the values of θ_{ij} are obtained from the experimental data in Eq. (33), and all CP violating phases δ, α_{21} and α_{31} are set to zero. U_ν diagonalizes m_{eff} in the following way:

$$U_\nu^T m_{eff}^T m_{eff} U_\nu = diag(m^2_{\nu_1}, m^2_{\nu_2}, m^2_{\nu_3}). \tag{35}$$

For the neutrino mass spectrum, we assume it to be normal hierarchical, i.e., $m_{\nu_1}<m_{\nu_2}<m_{\nu_3}$, and we choose the neutrino mass $m_{\nu_1} = 10^{-2}$ eV as input in our numerical analysis, considered that the tiny neutrino masses basically don't affect $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B}\to X_s\gamma)$ in the following and

limited on neutrino masses from neutrinoless double-β decay [48] and cosmology [49]. The other two neutrino masses $m_{\nu_{2,3}}$ can be obtained through the experimental data on the differences of neutrino mass squared in Eq. (33). Then, we can numerically derive $Y_{\nu_i} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-7})$ and $a_{\nu_i} \sim \mathcal{O}(-10^{-4}\text{GeV})$ from Eq. (35). Accordingly, $\upsilon_{\nu_i} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-4}\text{GeV})$ through Eq. (29). Due to $\upsilon_{\nu_i} \ll \upsilon_{u,d}$, we can have

$$\tan\beta \simeq \frac{\upsilon_u}{\upsilon_d}. \tag{36}$$

Recently, a neutral Higgs with mass around 125 GeV reported by ATLAS [50] and CMS [51] also contributes a strict constraint on relevant parameter space of the model. The global fit to the ATLAS and CMS Higgs data gives [52]:

$$m_h = 125.7 \pm 0.4 \text{ GeV}. \tag{37}$$

Due to the introduction of some new couplings in the superpotential, the SM-like Higgs mass in the $\mu\nu$SSM gets additional contribution at tree-level [16]. For moderate $\tan\beta$ and large mass of the pseudoscalar M_A, the SM-like Higgs mass in the $\mu\nu$SSM is approximately given by

$$m_h^2 \simeq m_Z^2 \cos^2 2\beta + \frac{6\lambda^2 s_W^2 c_W^2}{e^2} m_Z^2 \sin^2 2\beta + \triangle m_h^2. \tag{38}$$

Compared with the MSSM, the $\mu\nu$SSM gets an additional term $\frac{6\lambda^2 s_W^2 c_W^2}{e^2} m_Z^2 \sin^2 2\beta$. Therefore, the SM-like Higgs in the $\mu\nu$SSM can easily account for the mass around 125 GeV, especially for small $\tan\beta$. Including two-loop leading-log effects, the main radiative corrections can be given by [53–55]

$$\triangle m_h^2 = \frac{3m_t^4}{4\pi^2\upsilon^2}\Big[(t + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{X}_t) + \frac{1}{16\pi^2}(\frac{3m_t^2}{2\upsilon^2} - 32\pi\alpha_3)(t^2 + \tilde{X}_t t)\Big], \tag{39}$$

with

$$t = \log\frac{M_S^2}{m_t^2}, \qquad \tilde{X}_t = \frac{2\tilde{A}_t^2}{M_S^2}\Big(1 - \frac{\tilde{A}_t^2}{12M_S^2}\Big), \tag{40}$$

where $\upsilon = 174$ GeV, $M_S = \sqrt{m_{\tilde{t}_1} m_{\tilde{t}_2}}$ with $m_{\tilde{t}_{1,2}}$ being the stop masses, α_3 is the strong coupling constant, $\tilde{A}_t = A_t - \mu\cot\beta$ with A_t denoting the trilinear Higgs-stop coupling and $\mu = 3\lambda\upsilon_{\nu^c}$ being the Higgsino mass parameter.

Through the analysis of the parameter space in Ref. [16], we could choose the reasonable values for some parameters as $\kappa = 0.4$, $\lambda = 0.2$, $\upsilon_{\nu^c} = 1$ TeV and $m_{\tilde{L}} = m_{\tilde{e}^c} = A_e = 1$ TeV for simplicity in the following numerical calculation. Through Eq. (32), we could choose $A_\kappa = -300$ GeV to avoid the tachyons. For the Majorana masses of the gauginos, we will imply the approximate GUT relation $M_1 = \frac{\alpha_1^2}{\alpha_2^2} M_2 \approx 0.5 M_2$ and $M_3 = \frac{\alpha_3^2}{\alpha_2^2} M_2 \approx 2.7 M_2$. The gluino mass, $m_{\tilde{g}} \approx M_3$, is larger than about 1.2 TeV from the ATLAS and CMS experimental data [56–59]. So, we conservatively choose $M_2 = 1$ TeV. The first two generations of squarks are strongly constrained by direct searches at the LHC [60, 61]. Therefore, we take $m_{\tilde{Q}_{1,2}} = m_{\tilde{u}^c_{1,2}} = m_{\tilde{d}^c_{1,2}} = 2$ TeV. The third generation squark masses are not constrained by the LHC as strongly as the first two generations, and affect the SM-like Higgs mass. So, we could adopt $m_{\tilde{Q}_3} = m_{\tilde{u}^c_3} = m_{\tilde{d}^c_3} = 1$ TeV. When the masses of squarks are TeV scale, the contributions to $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ of squarks become small, so we could reasonably use the above choice in the following calculation. For simplicity, we also choose $A_{d_{1,2,3}} = A_{u_{1,2}} = 1$ TeV. As a key parameter, $A_{u_3} = A_t$ affects the following numerical calculation. In the limit of $\upsilon_{\nu^c} \gg \upsilon_{u,d}$ [62], the charged Higgs mass squared $M^2_{H^\pm}$ in the $\mu\nu$SSM can be formulated as

$$M^2_{H^\pm} \simeq M^2_A + (1 - \frac{6 s^2_W \lambda^2}{e^2}) m^2_W, \tag{41}$$

with the neutral pseudoscalar mass squared

$$M^2_A \simeq \frac{6\lambda \upsilon_{\nu^c}(A_\lambda + \kappa \upsilon_{\nu^c})}{\sin 2\beta}. \tag{42}$$

Considered that $M_{H^\pm}$ also is a key parameter which affects the numerical results, we could take $M_{H^\pm}$ as input to constrain the parameter A_λ.

Similarly to the MSSM and NMSSM [63], the new physics contributions to the branching ratio of $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ in the $\mu\nu$SSM depend essentially on the charged Higgs mass $M_{H^\pm}$, $\tan\beta$ and A_t. When $M_{H^\pm} = 1.5$ TeV, we plot $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ versus A_t in Fig. 2(a), for $\tan\beta = 3$ (dashed line) and $\tan\beta = 10$ (solid line). The dotted lines represent the experimental 1σ bounds. The numerical results show that $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ increases with increasing of A_t, and the slope of evolution for $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ is big as $\tan\beta$ is large. In Fig. 2(a), $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ will be easily below the experimental 1σ lower bound, when A_t is negative. For positive A_t, $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ still can exceed the experimental 1σ upper bound, as $\tan\beta$ is large enough.



FIG. 2: (a) $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ versus A_t for $\tan\beta = 3$ (dashed line) and $\tan\beta = 10$ (solid line), when $M_{H^\pm} = 1.5$ TeV. The dotted lines represent the experimental 1σ bounds. (b) The SM-like Higgs mass m_h versus A_t for $\tan\beta = 3$ (dashed line) and $\tan\beta = 10$ (solid line), where the gray area denotes the experimental 3σ interval.

So the new physics can give the considerable contributions to $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ for large $\tan\beta$ and A_t.

We also need consider the constraint of the SM-like Higgs mass. So in Fig. 2(b), we plot the SM-like Higgs mass m_h versus A_t for $\tan\beta = 3$ (dashed line) and $\tan\beta = 10$ (solid line), where the gray area denotes the experimental 3σ interval. When $\tan\beta = 3$, we require that A_t is about -2.65, -1.5, 1.9 or 3.05 TeV to keep the SM-like Higgs mass around 125 GeV. For $\tan\beta = 10$, we need A_t to be about -3.0, -1.0, 1.1 or 3.13 TeV, keeping the SM-like Higgs mass around 125 GeV.

In large M_A limit, the charged Higgs mass, $M_{H^\pm} \sim M_A \sim M_H$, doesn't affect the SM-like Higgs mass. So, we could choose $A_t = -3.0$, -1.0, 1.1 or 3.13 TeV, for $\tan\beta = 10$, to keep the SM-like Higgs mass around 125 GeV. Then, we draw $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ versus $M_{H^\pm}$ in Fig. 3, for (a) $A_t = 3.13$ TeV, (b) $A_t = 1.1$ TeV, (c) $A_t = -1.0$ TeV and (d) $A_t = -3.0$ TeV, respectively, when $\tan\beta = 10$. The horizontal dotted lines represent the experimental 1σ bounds. Here, we scan over the parameters v_{ν^c} and M_2 between 0.5 TeV and 1.5 TeV, which step is 0.05 TeV. For some $M_{H^\pm}$ and A_t, when v_{ν^c} and M_2 are small, $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ become large. Because the chargino masses are dependent on v_{ν^c} and M_2, which can give contributions to $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ through chargino-squark loop diagrams



FIG. 3: Br($\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$) versus $M_{H^\pm}$ for (a) $A_t = 3.13$ TeV, (b) $A_t = 1.1$ TeV, (c) $A_t = -1.0$ TeV and (d) $A_t = -3.0$ TeV, respectively, when $\tan\beta = 10$. Here, we scan over the parameters v_{ν^c} and M_2 between 0.5 TeV and 1.5 TeV, which step is 0.05 TeV. The horizontal dotted lines represent the experimental 1σ bounds.

in Fig. 1 (c) and (d). Due to constrain the heavy doublet-like Higgs mass $M_H \geq 642$ GeV [64, 65], we take the charged Higgs mass $M_{H^\pm} \gtrsim 700$ GeV. The numerical results show that Br($\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$) decreases along with increasing of $M_{H^\pm}$, because the contributions from charged Higgs diagrams decay like $1/M^4_{H^\pm}$ [63]. For small $M_{H^\pm}$, the new physics could contribute with large corrections to the branching ratio of $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$. In Fig. 3, Br($\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$) can exceed the experimental 1σ upper bound for small $M_{H^\pm}$, when $A_t = 3.13$ TeV. In addition, Br($\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$) can be easily below the experimental 1σ lower bound for $A_t = -3.0$ TeV, which is excluded by the experimental value at 1σ level.

V. CONCLUSION

The flavour changing neutral current process $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ offers high sensitivity to new physics. In this work, we investigate the branching ratio of the rare decay $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ in the framework of $\mu\nu$SSM under a minimal flavor violating assumption. Similarly to the MSSM and NMSSM, the new physics contributions to $\mathrm{Br}(\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma)$ in the $\mu\nu$SSM depend essentially on the charged Higgs mass $M_{H^\pm}$, $\tan\beta$ and A_t, because the mixings between charginos and charged leptons in the mass matrix of the $\mu\nu$SSM are suppressed, as well as those between charged Higgses and charged sleptons. Under the constraint of the SM-like Higgs with mass around 125 GeV, the numerical results show that the new physics can fit the experimental data for the rare decay $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ and further constrain the parameter space. Besides $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$, other $b \to s$ transitions e.g. ΔM_s, $S_{J/\psi\phi}$, $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$ also may give some constraints on relevant parameter space in this model, we will investigate this elsewhere in detail.

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NNSFC) with Grant No. 11275036, No. 11047002, the open project of State Key Laboratory of Mathematics-Mechanization with Grant No. Y3KF311CJ1, the Natural Science Foundation of Hebei province with Grant No. A2013201277, the Natural Science Fund of Hebei University with Grant No. 2011JQ05, No. 2012-242, and the Hundred Excellent Innovation Talents from the Universities and Colleges of Hebei Province with Grant No. BR2-201.

Appendix A: The interaction Lagrangian

In the $\mu\nu$SSM, The corresponding interaction Lagrangian of the $\bar{B} \to X_s\gamma$ process is written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{int} = \Big[S_\alpha^- \bar{d}_i (C_L^{S_\alpha^- \bar{d}_i u_j} P_L + C_R^{S_\alpha^- \bar{d}_i u_j} P_R) u_j$$

$$+ U_I^+ \bar{d}_i (C_L^{U_I^+ \bar{d}_i \chi_\alpha} P_L + C_R^{U_I^+ \bar{d}_i \chi_\alpha} P_R) \chi_\alpha \Big] + \text{H.c.}, \tag{A1}$$

with $P_{L,R} = (1 \mp \gamma_5)/2$, and the coefficients are

$$C_L^{S_\alpha^- \bar{d}_i u_j} = Y_{d_i} R_{S^\pm}^{1\alpha} V_{ji}^*, \tag{A2}$$

$$C_R^{S_\alpha^- \bar{d}_i u_j} = Y_{u_j} R_{S^\pm}^{2\alpha} V_{ji}^*, \tag{A3}$$

$$C_L^{U_I^+ \bar{d}_i \chi_\alpha} = Y_{d_i} Z_-^{2\alpha} R_u^{jI} V_{ji}^*, \tag{A4}$$

$$C_R^{U_I^+ \bar{d}_i \chi_\alpha} = \Big[-\frac{e}{s_W} Z_+^{1\alpha *} R_u^{jI} + Y_{u_j} Z_+^{2\alpha *} R_u^{(3+j)I} \Big] V_{ji}^*, \tag{A5}$$

where $R_{S^\pm}$, R_u and $Z_\mp$ can be found in Ref. [22], and V_{ji} denote the quark mixing matrix elements.

Appendix B: Form factors

Defining $x_i = \frac{m_i^2}{m_W^2}$, we can have the form factors:

$$I_1(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1 + \ln x_2}{(x_2 - x_1)} + \frac{x_1 \ln x_1 - x_2 \ln x_2}{(x_2 - x_1)^2}, \tag{B1}$$

$$I_2(x_1, x_2) = -\frac{1 + \ln x_1}{(x_2 - x_1)} - \frac{x_1 \ln x_1 - x_2 \ln x_2}{(x_2 - x_1)^2}, \tag{B2}$$

$$I_3(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{2} \Big[\frac{3 + 2 \ln x_2}{(x_2 - x_1)} - \frac{2x_2 + 4x_2 \ln x_2}{(x_2 - x_1)^2} - \frac{2x_1^2 \ln x_1}{(x_2 - x_1)^3} + \frac{2x_2^2 \ln x_2}{(x_2 - x_1)^3} \Big], \tag{B3}$$

$$I_4(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{6} \Big[\frac{11 + 6 \ln x_2}{(x_2 - x_1)} - \frac{15x_2 + 18x_2 \ln x_2}{(x_2 - x_1)^2} + \frac{6x_2^2 + 18x_2^2 \ln x_2}{(x_2 - x_1)^3} + \frac{6x_1^3 \ln x_1 - 6x_2^3 \ln x_2}{(x_2 - x_1)^4} \Big]. \tag{B4}$$

[1] S. Chen, et al., CLEO Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87 (2001) 251807.

[2] K. Abe, et al., BELLE Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B 511 (2001) 151.

[3] A. Limosani, et al., BELLE Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 103 (2009) 241801.

[4] J. P. Lees, et al., BABAR Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109 (2012) 191801.

[5] J. P. Lees, et al., BABAR Collaboration, Phys. Rev. D 86 (2012) 112008.

[6] J. P. Lees, et al., BABAR Collaboration, Phys. Rev. D 86 (2012) 052012.

[7] B. Aubert, et al., BABAR Collaboration, Phys. Rev. D 77 (2008) 051103.

[8] S. Stone, PoS ICHEP 2012 (2013) 033.

[9] M. Misiak, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 98 (2007) 022002.

[10] M. Misiak, M. Steinhauser, Nucl. Phys. B 764 (2007) 62.

[11] K. Chetyrkin, M. Misiak, M. Munz, Phys. Lett. B 400 (1997) 206.

[12] C. Greub, T. Hurth, D. Wyler, Phys. Rev. D 54 (1996) 3350.

[13] K. Adel, Y.-P Yao, Phys. Rev. D 49 (1994) 4945.

[14] A. Ali, C. Greub, Phys. Lett. B 361 (1995) 146.

[15] D. E. López-Fogliani, C. Muñoz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 97 (2006) 041801.

[16] N. Escudero, D. E. López-Fogliani, C. Muñoz, R. Ruiz de Austri, JHEP 0812 (2008) 099.

[17] J. Fidalgo, D. E. López-Fogliani, C. Muñoz, R. Ruiz de Austri, JHEP 1110 (2011) 020.

[18] J. E. Kim, H. P. Nilles, Phys. Lett. B 138 (1984) 150.

[19] H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rept. 110 (1984) 1.

[20] H. E. Haber, G. L. Kane, Phys. Rept. 117 (1985) 75.

[21] J. Rosiek, Phys. Rev. D 41 (1990) 3464.

[22] H.-B. Zhang, T.-F. Feng, G.-F. Luo, Z.-F. Ge and S.-M. Zhao, JHEP 1307 (2013) 069 [Erratum ibid. 1310 (2013) 173].

[23] H.-B. Zhang, T.-F. Feng, S.-M. Zhao, T.-J. Gao, Nucl. Phys. B 873 (2013) 300.

[24] H.-B. Zhang, T.-F. Feng, S.-M. Zhao, Fei Sun, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 29 (2014) 1450123.

[25] H.-B. Zhang, T.-F. Feng, F. Sun, K.-S. Sun, J.-B. Chen and S.-M. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D 89 (2014) 115007.

[26] G. Buchalla, A.J. Buras, M.E. Lautenbacher, Rev. Mod. Phys. 68 (1996) 1125.

[27] R. Grigjanis, P.J. ODonnell, M. Sutherland, H. Navelet, Phys. Rept. 22 (1993) 93.

[28] X.-Y Yang, T.-F Feng, JHEP 1005 (2010) 059.

[29] L. Lin, T.-F. Feng, F. Sun, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 24 (2009) 2181.

[30] A. J. Buras, L. Merlo, E. Stamou, JHEP 1108 (2011) 124.

[31] P. Goertz, T. Pfoh, Phys. Rev. D 84 (2011) 095016.

[32] P. Gambino, M. Misiak, Nucl. Phys. B 611 (2001) 338.

[33] M. Czakon, U. Haisch, M. Misiak, JHEP 0703 (2007) 008.

[34] A.J. Buras, M. Misiak, M. Müunz and S. Pokorski, Nucl. Phys. B 424 (1994) 374.

[35] T.-J Gao, T.-F Feng, J.-B Chen, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 27 (2012) 1250011.

[36] J. Beringer, et al., Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. D 86 (2012) 010001.

[37] P. Ghosh, S. Roy, JHEP 0904 (2009) 069.

[38] B. Pontecorvo, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 33 (1957) 549.

[39] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa, S. Sakata, Prog. Theor. Phys. 28 (1962) 870.

[40] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, J. Salvado, T. Schwetz, JHEP 1212 (2012) 123.

[41] P. Ghosh, P. Dey, B. Mukhopadhyaya, S. Roy, JHEP 1005 (2010) 087.

[42] A. Bartl, M. Hirsch, S. Liebler, W. Porodc, A. Vicente, JHEP 0905 (2009) 120.

[43] J. Fidalgo, D. E. López-Fogliani, C. Muñoz, R. Ruiz de Austri, JHEP 0908 (2009) 105.

[44] H.-B. Zhang, T.-F. Feng, L.-N. Kou, S.-M. Zhao, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 28 (2013) 1350117.

[45] H.-B. Zhang, T.-F. Feng, Z.-F. Ge, S.-M. Zhao, JHEP 1402 (2014) 012.

[46] S.M. Bilenky, J. Hosek, S.T. Petcov, Phys. Lett. B 94 (1980) 495.

[47] J. Schechter, J.W.F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D 22 (1980) 2227.

[48] J. Barea, J. Kotila and F. Iachello, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109 (2012) 042501.

[49] Planck Collaboration, P.A.R. Ade et al, arXiv:1303.5076.

[50] ATLAS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B 716 (2012) 1.

[51] CMS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B 716 (2012) 30.

[52] P.P. Giardino, K. Kannike, I. Masina, M. Raidal and A. Strumia, JHEP 1405 (2014) 046.

[53] M. Carena, J.R. Espinosa, M. Quirós, C.E.M. Wagner, Phys. Lett. B 355 (1995) 209.

[54] M. Carena, M. Quirós, C.E.M. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B 461 (1996) 407.

[55] M. Carena, S. Gori, N.R. Shah, C.E.M. Wagner, JHEP 1203 (2012) 014.

[56] ATLAS Collaboration, Phys. Rev. D 86 (2012) 092002.

[57] ATLAS Collaboration, JHEP 1310 (2013) 130.

[58] CMS Collaboration, JHEP 1301 (2013) 077.

[59] CMS Collaboration, JHEP 1307 (2013) 122.

[60] ATLAS Collaboration, Phys. Rev. D 87 (2013) 012008.

[61] CMS Collaboration, JHEP 1210 (2012) 018.

[62] J. Ellis, J.F. Gunion, H.E. Haber, L. Roszkowski, F. Zwirner, Phys. Rev. D 39 (1989) 844.

[63] F. Domingo, U. Ellwanger, JHEP 0712 (2007) 090.

[64] CMS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B 710 (2012) 26.

[65] ATLAS Collaboration, ATLAS-CONF-2013-067.